

## REMARKS

Claims 1-62 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated June 1, 2005, the Examiner noted that the Oath/Declaration did not identify the mailing address of each inventor. An application data sheet providing the mailing address that was inadvertently omitted from the previously filed application data sheet is included with this Amendment. The Examiner also objected to claims 11 and 37 and rejected claims 1-62. In response to the objection, appropriate corrections have been made to claims 11 and 37 to provide proper antecedent basis. Claims 1, 37, 50-54, and 57 have been amended by reordering the words merely to clarify that the first user's authentication credential is provided *to the resource*. Additionally, claims 1, 34, 37, 50, 51, and 54 have been amended to explicitly recite "*the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user.*" Claims 1-62 remain pending after this amendment. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-16, 18-20, 23-29, 31-40, 43-47, and 49-61 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brickell (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0147917). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that "Brickell discloses a computer-implemented method for managing access to a resource, comprising:...granting the second user access to the resource by providing the first user's authentication credential to the resource (Page 2, Paragraph 22)." In fact, to the contrary, Brickell discloses that "Once authenticated, the server 130 looks up the appropriate value associated with the delegate's identity in the table 434, and transmits the secured information  $E_1$  and the value, i.e.,  $K_{1,a}$  to the delegate 140." Page 2, paragraph 22. The delegate determines the key  $K$  for decrypting the encrypted information  $E_1$  from the a previously received value  $K_{1,b}$  and  $K_{1,a}$  received from the server. Page 2, paragraph 24. Thus, contrary to

the Examiner's assertion, Brickell does not teach or suggest granting the second user access to the resource by *providing to the resource* the first user's authentication credential. Rather, Brickell teaches that a delegate can access information using the values  $K_{1,b}$  and  $K_{1,a}$  that are *provided to the delegate*. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the reference and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejects claims 37, 50, 51, and 54 on a similar rationale as given for claim 1. The rejections of these claims are similarly unsupported by the cited reference and should also be withdrawn.

In addition claims 1, 37, 50, 51 and 54 have been amended to recite "*the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user.*" As discussed above, Brickell describes a system in which the values  $K_{1,b}$  and  $K_{1,a}$  are provided to the delegate. Hence, Brickell fails to disclose this limitation of the claims. Therefore, the pending rejection of these claims is traversed for this additional independent reason.

Regarding claim 34, the Examiner states that "Brickell discloses a system for granting access to a second user in response to a message from a first user, comprising: ... a resource interface... for granting the second user access to the resource by providing the first user's authentication credential to the authenticator for authentication (Page 2, Paragraph 22)." Brickell teaches that a delegate can access information using the values  $K_{1,b}$  and  $K_{1,a}$  that are *provided to the delegate*. Brickell does not disclose or suggest granting the second user access to the resource by providing the first user's authentication credential *to the authenticator* for authentication. Thus, the rejection of claim 34 is also unsupported by the reference and should be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 34 has been amended to recite "*the first user's authentication credential is not provided to the second user.*" As discussed above, Brickell describes a system

in which the values  $K_{1,b}$  and  $K_{1,a}$  are provided to the delegate. Hence, Brickell fails to disclose this limitation of the claims. Therefore, the pending rejection of this claim is traversed for this additional independent reason.

Regarding claim 16, the Examiner states that “Brickell discloses a computer-implemented method for managing levels of access to a resource for at least two users, comprising: Establishing a control relationship between a first user’s authentication credential and a second user’s authentication credential, the control relationship allowing the first user to specify at least one parameter of the second user’s level of access to the resource (Page 2, Paragraphs 18 and 19).” Brickell teaches regulating access to the secured information with respect to time and revoking access. Page 2, paragraph 26-29. However, Brickell does not disclose or suggest establishing a control relationship between the first user’s authentication credential and a second user’s authentication credential. Thus, the rejection of claim 34 is also unsupported by the reference and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejects claim 58 on a similar rationale as given for claim 16. The rejection of this claim is similarly unsupported by the cited reference and should also be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 52 and 53, the Examiner states that “Brickell discloses a client comprising:... an output device, for transmitting the received input to the access level control module to grant to the second user the access to the resource (Page 2, Paragraphs 18 and 19; and Pages 3-4, Paragraph 39).” At most, Brickell describes some implementations in which segments of data are encrypted with different keys. *See* page 3, paragraphs 32-33. Brickell does not describe or suggest an access level control module, nor transmitting input received by a client to an access level control module. Therefore, the rejections of claim 52 and 53 are also unsupported by the reference and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-15, 17-33, 35-36, 38-49, 55-57, and 59-62 are dependent claims that incorporate all of the limitations of at least one claim discussed above, and that further recite additional features and limitations.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, 17, 21, 22, 30, 41, 42, 48, and 62 over the combination of Brickell and Control-F1 (Control-F1, "Control-F1 Launches CF1Live 'Branded, Hosted, Rented' eSupport Solution", 7/6/2000, p. 1, obtained from [http://web.archive.org/web/20001121025300/www.control-fl.com/news/pr\\_cf1livelaunch.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20001121025300/www.control-fl.com/news/pr_cf1livelaunch.html)) and/or Onishi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0149667) and/or Chow et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0002678). For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims are unsupported by these references, and should be withdrawn.

Based on the above remarks, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments and remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,  
WILLIAM O'DONNELL, et al.

Dated: September 1, 2005

By:   
Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No.: 50,784  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7213  
Fax: (650) 938-5200